

-----Original Message-----

From: John Ugoretz [mailto:jugoretz@dfg.ca.gov]

Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2005 10:06 PM

To: somethingsfishy@charter.net

Cc: mlpacomments@resources.ca.gov

Subject: MLPAComments: Re: Slot size limits on the nearshore fishery

Tom,

Thanks for the comment. You are correct that the nearshore live-fish fishery has a very low bycatch rate and most discarded fish are returned live. I agree that a slot limit for this portion of the nearshore fishery would be one way to help protect fish that have already reached a large size. My statement was in reference to Alec's discussion of "groundfish" in general, of which most are deeper species and was not in reference to the specific point you raise. The BRTF should definitely be made aware of this and I'm copying the "MLPAComments" list so they all receive it.

It is also worth pointing out that by removing fish below a certain length from the population, you necessarily eliminate their ability to reach the larger size. Thus slot limits are most effective in populations where a standing stock of large old individuals already exists. If there are few existing large individuals, then slot limits become much less effective.

Your comment, however, brings up the valid point that there are many ways to address specific issues in marine fish management. Thanks again.

John

John Ugoretz  
Nearshore Ecosystem / MLPA Coordinator  
California Department of Fish and Game  
1933 Cliff Drive, Suite 9  
Santa Barbara, CA 93109  
(805) 560-6758  
(805) 568-1235 - fax  
jugoretz@dfg.ca.gov

>>> "sheri hafer" <somethingsfishy@charter.net> 02/24/05 8:06 PM >>>

John,

After Alec McCall's presentation, you made a statement that we are unable to protect large groundfish. This is not a true statement with respect to the nearshore live-fishery. Most fish can be returned live. The mandated Federal Observer program demonstrates this with an average of 1-2% bycatch rate. We have been asking the dfg to put a slot size limit in the nearshore fishery for years. The traps already do this with the 5 inch ring not allowing larger fish in, but their needs to be a slot limit for the hook fisherman. Your statement that "all the fish go back dead" was inaccurate and should be corrected to the BRTF since this is a key issue with MPA's. We know the benefit of protecting large fish and have been doing it now since 1997 with the ring. This was 4 years before dfg made it law. You were out of line misleading the BRTF members and not qualifying your statement to recognize the live-fish industry which will be the most directly impacted from the reserves.

Respectfully, Tom Hafer